

110,311
H13.

FIRST ANNUAL
REPORT OF THE
COUNCIL OF CHURCH
BOARDS OF EDUCA-
TION IN THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA




PROPERTY OF
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE LIBRARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

MD30.2
N213
JRH

1911-'12

A
1911/12




*National Council of the Churches of
" Christ in the U.S.A. Commission on
Higher Education*

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

Council of Church Boards of Education

IN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA



EDITED BY THE SECRETARY
1911-'12

76651


MD30.2

N213

JRH

A

1911/12



Officers and Members of the Council of Church Boards of Education

Officers.

President—REV. THOMAS NICHOLSON, D. D., Secretary Board of Education, Methodist Episcopal Church, New York City.

Vice-President—REV. E. S. TEAD, D. D., Secretary Board of Education, Congregational Church, Boston, Mass.

Secretary—REV. JOSEPH W. COCHRAN, D. D., Secretary Board of Education, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Philadelphia, Pa.

Members.

REV. STONEWALL ANDERSON, D. D., Secretary Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Nashville, Tenn.

PRESIDENT MINER LEE BATES, Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio, Secretary College Association of Disciples of Christ.

PRESIDENT HILL M. BELL, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, Disciples of Christ.

REV. W. T. CAMPBELL, United Presbyterian Church, Monmouth, Ill.

REV. J. G. GEBHARD, D. D., Secretary Board of Education of the Reformed Church, 25 E. 22d Street, New York City, N. Y.

REV. F. G. GOTWALD, D. D., Secretary Board of Education of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, York, Penna.

REV. J. W. HORINE, Corresponding Secretary Board of Education of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 1909 N. 12th St., Phila., Pa.

REV. RICHARD C. HUGHES, D. D., Secretary for University Work, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

REV. C. M. JACOBS, Evangelical Lutheran Church, Allentown, Penna.

PROFESSOR RUFUS M. JONES, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., of the Society of Friends.

PRESIDENT R. L. KELLEY, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind., Society of Friends.

REV. ROBERT MACKENZIE, D. D., Secretary College Board of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

REV. M. T. MORRILL, Dayton, Ohio, Christian Church.

REV. H. H. SWEETS, D. D., Secretary Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church, South, Louisville, Ky.

REV. A. J. TURKLE, D. D., Vice-President Board of Education of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Pittsburgh, Penna.

Contents

Officers and Members of the Council of Church Boards of Education.....	3
First Conference.....	5
Second Conference.....	7
Third Conference.....	11
Interdenominational Co-operation; by the Rev. Thomas Nicholson, D. D.....	14
Denominational Federation in Educational Work; by the Rev. E. S. Tead, D. D.....	17
Report of the Committee on Religious Work in State and Denominational Institutions.....	24
Comity and Co-operation Between Church and Educa- tional Agencies; by the Rev. Edward S. Tead, D. D..	37
Report of the Committee on Interdenominational Cam- paigns	46
Relation of Colleges to the Church and to Givers; by the Rev. Robert Mackenzie, D. D.....	48

First Conference

HELD IN THE OFFICE OF THE

Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church

150 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 18th, 1911

A group of the Secretaries of the Boards of Education of various churches met on the above date in the office of the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City, to confer concerning the advisability of forming an organization of all the educational agencies of the different denominations for the interchange of ideas and co-operation in work. There were present: Dr. Thomas Nicholson, Secretary of the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York), who was made chairman of the meeting; Dr. Henry H. Sweets, Secretary of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church, South, (Nashville), who was made secretary; Dr. Stonewall Anderson, Secretary of the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, (Nashville); Dr. Robert Mackenzie, Secretary of the College Board of the Presbyterian Church (New York); Dr. F. G. Gotwald, Secretary of the Lutheran Board (York, Pa.); Dr. Edward S. Tead, Secretary of the Congregational Education Society (Boston); and Dr. J. W. Cochran, Secretary of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church (Philadelphia).

This meeting was given over to an informal discussion of educational problems, and of the possibility of some united action in the interests of Christian education. It resulted in a decision to have a further conference at which papers should be presented on the following topics:—

1. A Survey and Exhibit of the Field and Conditions of Denominational Colleges. (Dr. Thomas Nicholson.)
 - (a) What Effect have the Present Conditions on the Minds of Givers?
 - (b) What Effect have the Present Conditions on the Colleges Themselves?
2. Critical Discussion of the Present and Prospective Reasons for the Denominational College. (Dr. Robert Mackenzie.)
 - (a) Alternative Definitions of Denominational Colleges.

3. What Lines of Denominational Federation with Autonomy are Feasible? (Dr. E. S. Tead.)
 - (a) What Joint Meetings?
 - (b) What Joint Literature might be wise?
4. What is the Relation of the Denominations to State Institutions? (Dr. J. W. Cochran.)
 - (a) A Survey of Conditions at State Institutions.
 - (b) Methods of Religious Work.
 - (c) What Federated Efforts are Feasible among the Denominations?



Second Conference

HELD IN THE OFFICES OF THE
Presbyterian College Board

156 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

APRIL 27th, 1911

The second meeting was held in the offices of the Presbyterian College Board in New York on the above date. In addition to the representatives present at the first Conference, Mr. Rufus M. Jones, representing the Educational Board of the Society of Friends, was present; also, Dr. Wallace Buttrick, of the General Education Board. The papers and addresses proved very interesting, and several principles were deduced as a result of the discussion of the situation in general, among them, the following:—

1. A large degree of co-operation between Educational Boards is practicable and desirable. Through them we might secure a better geographical distribution of denominational colleges, a valuable comity of relations in various particulars, a proper standardization of institutions; in many instances a better location and distribution of institutions, and large assistance through appropriations to weak but high grade schools for a limited period until they could meet the requirements of larger foundations, such as the General Education (Rockefeller) Board.

2. The denominations should offer loyal support to the public school system, and co-operate in efforts to secure larger appropriations for grammar and high schools from cities, counties and states, and this in no way interferes with their true mission in the sustentation of denominational colleges.

3. The legitimacy and the absolute necessity of a certain number of denominational academies, occupying strategic positions in territory not fully occupied by the public high schools. Notwithstanding the growth of the public high school, there is a work which it does not and cannot do, and the support and maintenance of these denominational academies is perfectly consistent with proper loyalty to the public and high school system.

4. There should be a direct approach by the denominations to the problem of religious instruction at State University centers. The State University needs the denominational college, and in very important particulars the denominational college is helped by the State University.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed:—

1. To organize an Interdenominational Conference of representative educational agencies.

2. That the membership of this conference should include the corresponding secretary of every denominational Board of Education, and, in addition thereto, one representative of such board, presumably a layman, appointed by each board.

The following officers of the permanent organization were elected:

Chairman—Dr. Thomas Nicholson (Methodist Episcopal).

Vice-Chairman—Dr. E. S. Tead (Congregational).

Secretary—Dr. J. W. Cochran (Presbyterian).

Drs. Nicholson and Cochran were appointed a committee to outline the work of five committees which were authorized, and to select the committees, these committees to report to a meeting of the body to be held in New York on Thursday, November 9, 1911.

In accordance with this action, the work was outlined as follows:

INTERDENOMINATIONAL COMMITTEES AND THEIR FIELDS

I. COMMITTEE ON COMITY AND CO-OPERATION: *Chairman*—Dr. E. S. Tead (Congregational); Professor Rufus Jones (Friends, Haverford College); Dr. Stonewall Anderson (Methodist Episcopal, South); Dr. Robert Mackenzie (Presbyterian—College Board).

The scope of this committee is indicated by the following outline of work assigned it:

The study of the principles which underlie necessary and feasible readjustments of existing denominational institutions, and the principles of interdenominational comity which should prevail in the founding of new institutions; conferences of teachers and workers in church schools of different denominations, particularly in sparsely settled States where inspirational gatherings are necessarily few; plans of standardization as to entrance requirements, content of curricula, the conditions of conferring honorary and other degrees, etc. Are any plans for co-operation among colleges in courses of study feasible, such as having different colleges in States where denominational schools are congested and cannot be eliminated, each trying to cover a limited field and thus to supplement each other? Are any plans for interchange of professors and instructors feasible? What other suggestions regarding comity and co-operation can be offered?

II. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC EFFICIENCY: *Chairman*—Dr. Robert Mackenzie (Presbyterian—College Board); Dr. Wallace Buttrick (General Education Board); Dr. Thomas Nicholson (Methodist Episcopal).

Scope of its work:

Comparison and contrast between expense for teaching and general cost of administration. What standards of economic efficiency can be discovered and applied to a college? Salaries of teachers and instructors—how regulated; their adequacy, a study of proportionate salaries as between presidents, professors, instructors, college agents or field secretaries, and others. Relative uniformity of tuition and other student expenses among the colleges; proper standardization of board, equipment, arrangement of dormitories, sanitation, conditions of health and morals, and how far can uniformity in desirable standards be secured?

III. COMMITTEE ON INTERDENOMINATIONAL CAMPAIGNS: *Chairman*—Dr. Thomas Nicholson (Methodist Episcopal); Dr. John G. Gebhard (Reformed); Dr. J. W. Cochran (Presbyterian).

Scope of its work:

What literature can be created common to all denominations which shall set forth the ground for the existence of the Christian college, its appeal to men of wealth, and how shall we best impress Christian men of all denominations with the vital necessity for, and the needs of, these colleges? A study of the place of the Church college in a unified system of public education, which shall include the gathering of statistics, showing the results of the work of the Christian College on the life of the church and the nation, the preparation of a workable plan for a series of inter-denominational conventions covering all parts of the country, and particularly the larger cities and towns, the same to be held three or four years hence, and to be so shaped that each denomination shall have its separate rallies at proper times, but all shall unite in certain general mass meetings, thus emphasizing the autonomy of the work of each in conjunction with the need of co-operation and universal appeal for a nation-wide cause. This committee to devise and report plans for program, for publicity, for raising necessary expense funds, etc.

This committee also to arrange conferences between the representatives of church and State schools for higher learning, for promoting opportunity for fellowship and better understanding of the problems which they have in common, the thought being that the time has come when denominational colleges and State universities, each having a distinctive and permanent place in the American educational system, should reach a better understanding and have a basis of mutual co-operation.

IV. COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS WORK IN STATE AND DENOMINATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: *Chairman*—Dr. J. W. Cochran (Presbyterian); Dr. H. H. Sweets (Presbyterian, South); Dr. E. S. Tead (Congregational).

Scope of its work:

In Church Schools: A study of the proper content of biblical instruction, and studies in religion and ethics which should be incorporated in the curriculum of a denominational college; the promotion of better methods and plans for the nurture of the religious life among their students; the promotion of a proper relation between the denominational college and the ecclesiastical body under whose auspices it is conducted, so that the relation shall be vital and satisfactory without encroaching upon true educational freedom in teaching and administration; a study of the place and value of the Christian Associations in both State and denominational institutions, and the promotion of plans of co-operation between the Associations and the respective Christian bodies; a study of the relation of Student Volunteer, Temperance, Social Service and Missionary Societies to the life of the college; the promotion of better plans for the counseling of students on questions of future vocation looking toward the securing of a proper proportion of our young people for the ministry and for various lines of Christian service.

In State Schools: An historical study of the place of religion in State schools of higher learning; a study of the secularization of higher education under State control; of the invasion of the field of the church school by the State schools; of the relation of professional and technical departments in State schools, which call increasing numbers of student church members to their halls, and their relation to modern church life; a study of the responsibility of the church for the promotion of the religious life of students in State educational institutions, the plan of the work, the methods of approach, the type which shall be accepted and promoted by the individual denominations, other types, and a study of the unworked field.

V. COMMITTEE ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS: *Chairman*—Dr. Stonewall Anderson (Methodist Episcopal, South); Dr. F. G. Gotwald (Lutheran); Professor Rufus M. Jones (Friends).

Scope of its work:

The high school's ability or inability to cover the whole field of secondary education; the value of boarding schools growing out of the needs of moral and religious training and the emergencies of the period of adolescence; the character, curriculum, and equipment necessary for the general efficiency of denominational academies—Academies co-educational or otherwise; a study of vocational counseling in high schools and academies; an outline of plans for the religious instruction and nurture of students in these academies. How far should these academies be strictly preparatory schools? How far should courses in commerce, music, domestic science, etc., be introduced? Should courses in English Bible, ethics, and religion form a part of their curriculum, and if so, for what shall they be substituted? How shall they be related to the respective church bodies? The best methods of raising funds for these schools; proper rates of tuition and student expenses. How far are uniform standards in all these matters practicable for all the denominations and for the different parts of the country.

The above outline will indicate the scope of the study contemplated. Anyone who will give careful thought to the movement must see that there is here a wide range of subjects on which there should be the most perfect understanding possible between the different denominations.

Third Conference

HELD IN THE

Witherspoon Building, 1319 Walnut St., Philadelphia

10.00 A. M. JANUARY 17th, 1912

Prayer was offered by the Rev. Dr. E. S. Tead, after which the Minutes of the meeting of April 27th, 1911 were read and approved.

The Secretary was instructed to call attention to the fact that the officers of the Conference changed the date of the meeting from Thursday, November 9th, 1911, at New York, to January 17th, 1912, in Philadelphia, owing to inability to secure the attendance of a number of the representatives.

President Miner Lee Bates, of Hiram College, Secretary of the College Association of the Disciples of Christ explained the standing of the College Association with his denomination. The College Association being the only general educational agency of the denomination, was accepted on the same basis as a Board.

On motion it was agreed that each delegate should be requested to send printed matter relative to the organization and work of his Board or Association to the Secretary for filing in the archives.

On motion a Committee was appointed consisting of the President, Secretary and Dr. Gotwald, which should present, before the close of the meeting, a permanent name for the Conference.

The action of the President in arranging the number and personnel of Committees was approved. The addition of one Committee, that on Secondary Schools, to the four committees already constituted by the Conference, was also approved.

On motion the President and Secretary were constituted a Committee to nominate the membership of standing committees for the ensuing year.

The Committee on Comity and Co-operation, Dr. E. S. Tead, Chairman, presented its report in the form of a paper written by Dr. Tead. Its reading was followed by a general discussion.

On motion a Committee on Publicity was appointed consisting of Prof. Rufus M. Jones, Rev. F. G. Gotwald, D. D., and Rev. J. G. Gebhard, D. D.

Committee on Name presented the following:—

“COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION.”

The report of the Committee was unanimously adopted.

The following resolution was presented by Dr. Tead and unanimously adopted:—

“*Resolved*, That this Council recommend to its members the importance of mutual conference and consultation whenever plans are under consideration by their respective Boards for entering new fields.”

The Committee on Religious Work in Denominational and State Schools read its report in the form of a paper by the Chairman, Dr. Cochran.

The following resolution presented by the Committee was adopted:—

“That all the denominations represented in this Conference be requested to consider seriously the problems here presented, direct their national representatives to visit these institutions, study the situation at first hand and inaugurate a serious effort to meet the religious needs of their own students in these State controlled institutions of higher learning.”

The Committee on Interdenominational Campaigns, Dr. Nicholson, Chairman, presented its report without recommendations.

On motion the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

“*Resolved*, That an Annual Meeting of this Council be held in 1913 on Wednesday, January 15th, or, in case that date be found impracticable, upon such a proximate date as may be agreed upon by the Executive Committee.

“*Resolved*, Further, That a Committee consisting of the President, Vice President and Secretary be appointed to draw up a brief constitution and by-laws, to report to this body at the next regular meeting.

“*Further Resolved*, That the Executive Committee, consisting of the President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer, be empowered to arrange for a special meeting about the last week in June, 1912 if in their judgment the reports of Committees shall indicate the necessity of so doing.”

The Report of the Committee on Publicity and Publications was received and unanimously adopted. The recommendations follow:—

“*Resolved*, That the proceedings of the Council during the year be published and that the money for the purpose be secured by requesting sufficient pro rata sums from the Boards represented in this Council; that the preparation of this publication be placed in the hands of the Secretary with power.”

"*Resolved*, That a careful summary of the work of to-day be prepared for the daily press and that the members of the Council endeavor to secure publication of information concerning the work of the Council by the newspapers and periodicals of their own denominations."

"*Resolved*, That the Church Boards recognized in the Minutes to-day be considered the Charter members of the Council.

"*Resolved*, That the admission of other Boards or members hereafter be made on application or invitation through a majority vote."

The report of the Committee on Interdenominational Campaigns was ordered filed and printed.

The following officers were re-elected for the ensuing year:—

President—Rev. Thomas Nicholson, D. D.

Vice President—Rev. E. S. Tead, D. D.

Secretary and Treasurer—Rev. Joseph W. Cochran, D. D.

The officers were made an Executive Committee and this Executive Committee was made a Committee on Standing Committees, and requested to assign the new members to these committees.

On motion the Council adjourned.



Interdenominational Co-operation

By THE REV. THOMAS NICHOLSON, D. D.,

Secretary of the Board of Education, Methodist Episcopal Church,
New York City.

READ AT THE FIRST CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 18, 1911.

The Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church recently discussed the possibilities of federating all the denominations in a co-operative general educational campaign, calculated to create enthusiasm and deepen conviction as to the need of the denominational college.

There are many influences tending to secularize even our Christian education. We need not enumerate them. Many things indicate the need of a solidarity of Protestantism. There is a work which no separate board can do. It is a time of interdenominational movements. We think the time has arrived for the appointment of a committee which shall invite a similar number from each of the other denominational boards, for the purpose of organizing an interdenominational movement in which each denomination shall preserve its autonomy and plan to take care of its own schools, but in which all shall unite for a campaign something like that of the Laymen's Missionary Movement.

The chief purpose would be to awaken the American church conscience to a new conception of the value and vital necessity of distinctively Christian schools, to intensify the conviction of the need of a definite religious life and instruction in them, and to create a spirit of liberality toward them. All together can do this as a separate denomination cannot. A literature created by such a combination would attract the attention of all the denominations, and such a united movement would get public attention in a new and larger way. This organization would help to eliminate waste and unnecessary competition.

Excepting where institutions have become very strong, there is no good reason why colleges of different denominations should compete with each other in the same city. In new territory there could easily be such a distribution of institutions that each of the leading denominations at least should be represented, but their colleges placed at different centers so that each has a general local constituency in addition to its state-wide denominational field. Christian

education is one. There is room in almost every state for at least one college under the auspices of each of the more prominent denominations; and, if they can be properly distributed in the different parts of the state, they can all work together harmoniously. The map of the State of Indiana shows how finely this distribution can be made. Such an organization could draft a statement concerning the grounds and reasons for the Christian college, considering, for instance, questions like these:

If the field were entirely open, would we put denominational schools into our national educational system, and, if so, why?

How much is the case for the Christian college strengthened by the history and traditions of these schools? How much is it strengthened by the fact that they still do a work, the demands of which greatly increase the burdens of the state if we withdrew?

How far are they justified on the ground that, being voluntary, their personal appeal constitutes one of the most valuable elements in spreading educational intelligence and creating educational spirit in the country? How far through the fact that the cultivation of the benevolent spirit in individuals, brought about through their gifts to these schools, is, in itself, a great educative, uplifting and Christianizing force?

Other elements would enter, but an appeal uniform for all the denominations, based upon a discussion of such topics in a great campaign certainly ought to give us a new conviction as to the necessity for the Christian college. It might result in five or six years in the giving of many millions of dollars for these institutions, and it would tend, again, to make American education definitely and broadly Christian.

There is a more far-reaching influence than the strengthening of the institution of any denomination. This is America. The majority rules. Such an intelligent awakening and such a support of church colleges would have a reflex influence on State and private institutions. It would make it practically impossible for any agnostic or non-Christian man to be head of or a leading professor in any state or private institution. Public sentiment would be aroused. We should then exist side by side, and in friendly relations with a State education which, as the result of intelligent public opinion, and the new conviction of the elemental truths for which evangelical Christianity stands, should become in a very large and increasing degree thoroughly Christian.

Then, intensify the religious life of the particular colleges and the solidarity of the denominational organization. Consider the need of organizing a group of studies to include such subjects as "The Philosophy of Religion," "Christian

Ethics," "Christian Sociology," "English Bible," "Apologetics," and subjects of that group as electives in the curriculum of each of the denominational schools, and the need of devising means for intensifying the religious life in a broad and modern yet vital way. That such a discussion would be timely is shown by an article in the *Biblical World* in which the denominational colleges were attacked for their lack of this sort of study, and an effort was made to show that the State and large independent institutions were really giving much more attention to such subjects and to vital religion than were most of the denominational colleges.

This is intimately related to another subject—the relation of the denominations to the care of their young people in State and undenominational institutions. There are about 130,000 distinctively college students in the United States of whom 56,000 are in State schools.

There is great need of such a movement because in this rich and masterful age there is a disinclination on the part of many to assume the responsibilities and undergo the sacrifice involved in Christian leadership. The multiplication of luxury, the passion for pleasure, and other things about us create problems which are strikingly perplexing. The rural religious problem is coming to challenge our sense of need quite as much as that of the city.

There is also need of a great new conscience touching the ministry of money and of culture. Men must be made to look upon talents, culture, superior intelligence, not as giving them peculiar advantages for getting things for themselves, but as great opportunities for service to others. We need in various ways to preach a new crusade in this regard, and the colleges are strategic places. It is doubtful whether men of fortune are meeting their opportunities in this regard.

Such a movement as that which is proposed, joined in by all the denominations, would tend to minimize mere creedal and sectarian emphasis, and to bring us a great new awakening on this broader and more vital Christian line in which we must all be interested.

Denominational Federation in Educational Work

By THE REV. E. S. TEAD, D. D.

Corresponding Secretary Board of Education, Congregational Church,
Boston, Mass.

READ AT THE SECOND CONFERENCE, APRIL 27, 1911

The question of the possible federation of Christian schools and colleges in this country is one which has not yet been seriously considered either by the Educational Boards of our denominations or by the institutions themselves.

The time has now come, however, when Christian churches recognize that they must give an account of their stewardship in this matter of Christian education. Unbidden by them, the question has arisen, and will remain, until we make the attempt, at least, to find a satisfactory solution.

At the outset of the consideration of this matter we are amazed at its magnitude and the way its possibilities loom up. We are puzzled as to where our attention should be first directed. However, as we are now blazing the way through a trackless forest, we are willing to misspend some energy and waste language in an attempt to lay before ourselves the various aspects of the case.

Where, then, shall we look for any union of effort along the lines of Christian education? Where shall the initiative be taken?

For one thing it is apparent that there should be an effort to secure harmonious action among the **educational boards** of the Christian denominations of the country. These various boards are influential in determining the character and scope of educational efforts in their respective denominations. They plant and foster schools and colleges. It may be said truthfully that most of the colleges of the country have been organized under denominational relationships more or less intimate. At this point, then, it would seem as though unification of effort should begin, but how?

The writer ventures to suggest that a conference be held twice a year in New York City, or at any point where a majority of the offices of Boards of Education are located, consisting of the secretaries of these Boards of the Christian denominations of the country. This body could be voluntary, advisory, deliberative in character.

The membership would better be confined to the secretaries because they are most familiar with the fields of operation and the questions relating thereto. The lay and clerical members of our Boards are not generally familiar with all the conditions, and, for the present, at least, the conference will have no legislative functions. If this conference should be too large there would always be difficulty in securing attendance. If a given secretary cannot be present it may be understood that he has a right to send a substitute.

The purpose of the conference would be to furnish information as to the plans of action contemplated, or already employed, by our denominational educational boards; to consider new fields to be occupied; to consider what possible readjustments there may be among colleges already in existence; to create a spirit of fellowship in this great work of education among the churches at home and the institutions on the field.

Has not the time come, brethren, when we should be willing to bring our separate interests to the bar of our common and united consideration; when we should combine to arouse the thoughts of our people on this question of Christian education along new lines, and open before them larger possibilities of our mission; when we should unitedly endeavor to awaken our churches so that we may secure from them a more generous financial support and more intelligent interest than we now obtain? Such a permanent conference would be a clearing house for all matters relating to educational institutions of the Protestant faith, where each denomination would freely contribute its accumulated wisdom for the common good.

Such questions as the place and outlook of the Christian school in coming years, the raising of money, student aid, advertising, printing, mission study class literature, superintendence of institutions on the field, partition of territory, and many other subjects that we are now trying to settle each for himself would receive more careful treatment and inspiring counsel from the combined deliberation of this goodly fellowship. Nothing but good could possibly come from such a meeting. No denomination would imperil its rights or interests, but, on the contrary, would receive new points of view, largeness of grasp, and a more intelligent purpose. Just let me cite an instance or two as showing the need of such mutual deliberation.

In one section of our country, where three denominations are at work side by side, an effort was made to get the prin-

cipals and the teachers of these institutions together for a yearly conference, as to methods of work, etc., etc.

The workers all responded eagerly to the suggestion and welcomed the opportunity of becoming acquainted with each other on the mission field, but it was prevented by an official of one of the denominations, greatly to the disappointment of the workers.

Another incident. A secretary of one of the denominational Boards visited and examined a school under, or rather more or less connected with, another denomination, and as a result of his call left the impression upon local trustees that he would take the school under his care if the other denomination should refuse to increase the annual appropriation to the school. Now such a conference as is here proposed would have covered all this ground.

Brethren, it seems to me that the crux of this whole situation is right here: whether we, as secretaries, are ready to organize this conference with one another wherein we would be perfectly willing to frankly disclose our plans and purposes, and that each one have the benefit of the purpose and experience of all the others. Do we believe the time has come for such mutual confidence? Are we satisfied that only good will result from it? Do we believe that the time has come to form such an alliance for a forward movement for Christian education?

The writer had noted several directions toward which federation might work, but the more he contemplated the subject the less sure was he that the time had arrived to speak of them. It seemed wiser at this present meeting to discuss frankly the fundamental questions already mentioned, and if our decision was in favor of united efforts, then to appoint sub-committees for more thorough and more intelligent investigation and report later on. Such committees might be:

1. On mission schools in New Mexico and Utah, or, if thought best, a committee on each of these sections.
2. On academies.
3. On colleges.
4. On industrial schools.

These four broad divisions offer plenty of opportunity for careful, painstaking deliberation, and the facts obtained would be of vast importance in reaching a proper basis for further efforts. At present such facts are wanting, and we are, therefore, unprepared to draw satisfactory and definite inferences for our guidance.

In substance, then, this is what I have to offer to-day. Before I close, however, will you let me mention some of

the matters which it seems to me would naturally come before these various committees?

1. The merging of colleges. I think we will agree that if the time has not come it will inevitably when this great question will have to be seriously considered. There is no doubt that if we were starting anew in this business of founding colleges we would not place some of them where they are now. They are not strategically located. Some were placed in the rural region. A present system might place them near centers of population. Some of them are too thickly clustered, and do not serve as many of the population as they might. Some are under the auspices of denominations closely allied, and cannot, therefore, justify themselves in these days when the religious bodies are coming together.

If these facts are recognized as to things that are past, then a vital question arises, whether it is not time to readjust, as we may be able to do, this old order and combine certain colleges to the advantage of all concerned.

2. But if this system cannot be wisely changed at present, the committee would also consider whether there might not be more coöperation among our colleges in the way of courses of study. Two colleges, fifty or a hundred miles apart, need not try to cover the same ground, but one college might supplement the work of another.

For instance, if one is strong in classics and one in the sciences, let them emphasize their excellencies and abandon their inferior courses. Again, would not an interchange of professors and instructors be feasible, such as is now carried on by Harvard and the German universities, and also between Harvard and four colleges in the West? Again, might there not be some sort of federation in standardizing requirements for admission to, and of courses in, our colleges so that a more uniform progress in high grade work might be attained? Once more, would not a legitimate subject for discussion in our common interest be the salaries paid our instructors? This question, while purely economic, is playing an important part in the well-being of our colleges to-day, and instructors are being influenced, as we no doubt all are, by this matter of fitting compensation for their talents and services. An investigation would uncover the whole present wage situation in the educational world, and give us data for suggesting any readjustments that might seem necessary in order to hold in our service the kind of teaching talent we so much need. Further, the question of student expenses in our institutions might well be a subject of investigation. Whether

uniformity of tuition might be adopted and a general readjustment of the cost of board, so that our institutions would not present to the public widely varying schedules of expenses, are matters for careful notice.

Another field for review would naturally be the kind and amount of ethical and religious instruction given or to be offered by colleges. Could there be any wise coördination of courses in ethical and religious training such as would suit the cosmopolitan constituencies to which we all make our appeal?

Academies.—The committee on academies would have to consider some of the foregoing particulars, inasmuch as they are common to schools of both grades.

There is, however, an additional question that pertains especially to academies, and that is whether it might not be wise in some instances to sell out entirely to town or county authorities who are contemplating opening new high schools, and to use the money obtained from these sales for the benefit of academies now prosperous and well located and needing only larger endowment to make them permanent. There is a place in all our States for high grade boarding schools of the religious kind, even alongside of well equipped high schools. Such boarding schools would have a secure future and become a greater help to the Christian Church if they had a substantial backing. Would it not be wiser to have a few good, strong schools than to try to maintain many poorly equipped and unfortunately placed institutions which have a precarious hold on life, and which must, in the end, be crowded out of existence?

Mission Schools.—Turning to the mission schools among the neglected races in our country, such as are sustained at present by some of our denominations, we shall find, I think, that investigation would yield substantial facts as a basis for better work in the future. In the first place, the boundaries of the fields of these schools should be carefully considered, and the division of territory to be covered might be wisely determined. Work among such peoples who have not enjoyed a legacy of educational advantages may be somewhat varied. Could there not be a more general introduction of certain forms of industrial training to advantage as a ground work for future educational efforts, and as a means of securing the interest of the people in education?

Do not certain races need just this sort of training as a kind of resurrection of their inert faculties? A thorough investigation would be most helpful. But a more important

question would be the attitude of mind of the teachers and workers going among these people. The spirit of the worker's attitude towards an alien race calls for rigid scrutiny. Has she sympathy, can she put herself in another's place, can she see life from another's viewpoint, is she a missionary as well as a teacher? Brethren, our work in the field often suffers from a fundamental lack in the disposition and the minds of our workers, and there should be no such thing as an easy transit from one denomination to another by the "lame ducks" who utterly fail because of these vital defects before mentioned. We should stand together in securing the highest grade women for our schools, for this practically foreign work in our own country.

Further, this committee, I believe, should encourage mutual counsel and harmony of action among our various workers on the field. Whatever differences divide us here at home, brethren, should not be transferred to the mission field.

Might it not be well for the workers in Utah, for instance, to come together once a year, say before the schools open, for a rally for encouragement and mutual interchange, and so on other fields? In our own work in New Mexico I brought this about some years ago, and with marked results for good.

As you know, the teachers are placed in little hamlets, widely scattered, where they meet very few of their own sort during the year. They get lonely and accumulate quite a degree of mental rust as they are exposed day in and day out to the corroding atmosphere of mental inertia and moral darkness. They need all the warmth and support of their fellow workers it is possible to give them. But this fellowship ought to widen and take in all who are working for the Lord in their section of the country. Before our teachers reach their fields of work, let them stop for a day or two at some convenient Elim, just on the edge of the desert into which they must so soon journey, and break bread together, clasp each other's hands, and fortify their spirits with assurances of mutual interest and oneness of purpose.

Such, in brief, are some of the suggestions that occur to me as I try, in this haphazard fashion, to indicate some ways along which we may walk together. The main question is, not whether any one of these hints may be carried out into actual operation—a deeper search into the present situation will decide that—but the more important thing is whether they stir us to a desire for concerted action, for harmony in work, for a stronger purpose, to band our forces together for more effective prosecution of our common responsibilities.

Certain wealthy men in our day have dedicated millions of money for education, and will no doubt add still more to the vast sums already bestowed. Nothing like this in the history of the world has ever been seen. These men have done this because they realized the country's need of a higher grade of man and woman. They have been far-seeing in their outlook.

Has not the day come, brethren, when the churches should be rallied for the cause of Christian education? Should not the church of Jesus Christ take the same statesmanlike view? May we not, as leaders in our denominations, by a united front impress this duty on the wealthy members of our churches? Can we not devise some plan whereby we may be able to lay this claim on their hearts and consciences?

Identity of aim, harmony of purpose, clearness of vision among us who are regarded as leaders, may be the one thing needed to make this impression deep, lasting, fruitful.

Report of the Committee on Religious Work in State and Denominational Institutions.

READ AT THE THIRD CONFERENCE, JANUARY 17th, 1912

Among the problems presented to this Committee is the following:—"A Study of the Place and Value of the Christian Associations in Both State and Denominational Institutions and the Promotion of Plans of Co-operation Between the Associations and the Respective Christian Bodies". We are also expected to make an historical study of the place of religion in such schools of higher learning; to consider the secularization of higher education under State control; the increase of professional and technical departments in these schools winning increasing numbers of student church members to their halls; the relation of these students to modern church life; the consequent responsibility of the Church for the promotion of the religious life of such students; plans proposed, methods of approach already adopted, the type or types best suited for the work of the denominations and a study of the unworked field.

Such a survey will of necessity be more extended than the limits of a single report will permit. We therefore propose in the present instance to narrow our present inquiry to a consideration of

RELIGIOUS LIFE AT STATE UNIVERSITY CENTRES.

A Survey of the Situation.

A great unchallenged assumption has cost the Church of Jesus Christ dearly during the past two generations. That assumption is that the divorce of Church and State means the divorce of religion from State institutions. The failure or refusal of religious leaders to comprehend the great truth that the Church and State are but different activities of the same people, that if the State is to be considered Christian its schools must be vitally if not officially religious, has constituted an opportunity for secularism to declare that the recognition of religion is repugnant to the ideals of a free society. "Religious Education", said Commissioner Harris in 1892, "has almost entirely ceased in our public schools." Judge Peter Grosscup declares this to be the one blot on the

American public schools—the exclusion of spirituality as one of the great facts of the world. “As long as America turns her back upon religion she is excluding the most powerful influence for good, both spiritual and civil, that the world has at its command.”

But a change is now noted by the more seriously minded leaders of the educational world. Dr. Shailer Mathews deplores the habit of putting “interrogation points into our faculty chairs and then asking our students to be exclamation marks. A God under investigation,” he declares, “is not a God over whom you can be enthusiastic.” He professes to see, however, that public education is slowly coming to the realization that religion and ethics are bound up in the very heart of a true education.

Let us agree that the schools of the State cannot teach any form of religion or any particular theological tenet. This, however, does not imply that an institution cannot recognize the great fact of religion and teach the fear and love of God through the influence and example of her educators. President Harper once said that while a university may not cultivate the religious spirit in such a manner as to interfere with our separate individualism, there rests upon it, nevertheless, a great obligation to produce a strongly pronounced religious spirit.

We believe that while in State Universities there is little official effort to spiritualize education, there is a marked eagerness among those in authority to secure religious influences for their students. Thorough investigation finds scarcely a State University whose highest officials are indifferent to this matter, and in a number of them the religious life of a professor and his affiliation with some branch of the Christian Church is regarded as adding weight to his qualifications for the position. We are, it would seem, at the turning point in educational development when the craze for numbers and costly equipment is suffering a reaction, and dynamic appeals to conscience, to righteousness and to the love and service of God, are permeating the work of these institutions.

But the problem before us is to discover how the great mass of secularity heaped up in these State institutions can be leavened. There is no official antagonism, no organized infidelity to deal with. A state of preoccupation is encountered, the student being overwhelmed with a multitude of interests not the least of which are extra-academic. The Christian student who has never been accustomed to spend Sunday in study or social diversions is at once plunged into an atmos-

phere where nine out of ten students do not regard Sunday study or play as of any moral significance. Yet this attitude toward the observances of religion is not confined to state institutions. The State University contains on the whole about as much moral life as the average Church college, and as regards church affiliations, we find the percentage higher in the State University than in society at large, fifty-seven per cent. of students being communicants of Christian churches. A few years ago the Committee of six of the Religious Education Association found that 62% at the University of Illinois were church members or adherents; 71% at Kansas, 78% at Missouri, 81% at Michigan, 98% at Iowa.

But the statistics based upon matriculation blanks can hardly give an accurate idea of the situation. As the student gets deeper into the University life he becomes not necessarily irreligious but non-religious, separating himself from the life of the community. President Strong of Kansas speaks of the student's attitude as one of aloofness from society and its institutions. While church and home ties bound him before, now his whole interest is centered in the college and its activities.

This situation, acute enough in connection with an institution of normal growth, is rendered doubly acute by the enormous rapidity with which state institutions are growing. There are in the United States eighty-one State Universities and other State aided institutions of higher learning with a total student enrollment for the year 1909-'10 of 109,000. Some idea can be gained as to the character of this growth from the following table:—

	1879-'80	1889-'90	1899-'00	1909-'10
Wisconsin	376	893	2,422	4,947
Michigan	1,427	2,153	3,441	5,383
Illinois	438	469	2,234	4,784
Nebraska	259	474	2,209	3,992
Colorado	25	74	433	1,221
Kansas	440	508	1,150	2,303
Iowa	557	737	1,437	2,352
Ohio	287	425	1,252	3,275
Washington	160	217	514	2,156
Minnesota	308	1,002	3,236	5,365
Texas		309	1,041	3,043
Indiana, Bloomington..	184	321	1,016	2,564

It might be possible to extend this inquiry to an altogether

unwarranted length. We must therefore sum up the points hinted at, as follows:—The State University is a confessedly secular institution. It is permitted by state laws to teach everything except religion. The tone and atmosphere of these schools is secularized, and moral and religious life often deadened by the submergence of the humanities in the demand for technical and professional training. The theory of academic freedom has resulted in an abdication on the part of these institutions of the trusteeship of student character to a very large degree. Occasionally an educator is found who makes a point of training students into a skeptical attitude to the fundamentals of religion, and who takes the position that to be uncertain of everything is to be scientific.

These institutions, nevertheless, have a large religious constituency, and of late years have, in many ways, recognized their obligation to encourage the approach of religious influences. Their tremendous growth has made the problem of religious life and work among the student bodies peculiarly baffling and difficult. The moral life of the student is generally of a higher tone than that of the average society, but the break of years with organized Christianity and the pre-occupation of the student with new and absorbing interests, produces in the end a drift into religious indifference occasioning immense loss to the nation and to the Church.

II. METHODS OF APPROACH.

1. The University Itself.

The State University, hedged about by statutes providing against the use of State funds for religious purposes, will never, in all likelihood be able to be a large factor in the promotion of religious life among its students. As these universities grow in size and in wide diversity of departmental groups, chapel exercises are abandoned. Minnesota and Kansas are notable exceptions to the rule. State College, Pennsylvania, has a preaching service Sunday morning, almost unique among state institutions. It is unlikely that the hope of President Strong of Kansas that religious influences from within should take precedence of all others, can be realized under present conditions. Michigan and Iowa have issued religious bulletins and given semi-formal recognition to religious lectureships by local pastors or representatives of the denominations, by allowing the use of their halls and a limited amount of credit towards certain degrees. The University of West Virginia has conducted a summer school of methods for religious

teachers, a unique and exceptional movement among State Universities, former President Purinton holding that "it is manifestly proper that any university should offer exact and sympathetic instruction as to the great facts and principles of the Christian faith" and that "it is both the right and the duty of the State University to recognize teachers of religion and to provide for their proper instruction." Nevertheless we do not look for a general adoption of such a policy; on the contrary we believe that universities, while encouraging the approach from without, will less and less recognize in any formal manner the need of providing religious instruction. A number of State Universities actually decline to include in their matriculation blanks questions relating to the student's church affiliations.

2. The Y. M. and Y. W. C. A.'s.

These voluntary Associations of young people were for years the only active influence at work. They were heartily welcomed by the University authorities and have been supported loyally in their efforts to meet the spiritual interests of the students. These Associations, often handicapped by lack of mature leadership, and hampered by the insistent athletic and social demands that have become in time more or less intertwined with their work, have been faithful to their trust and, while not successful in securing the membership of one third of the average student body, deserve the gratitude of the churches for their achievements.

The responsibility for an unsatisfactory condition does not rest entirely with the Associations, for they certainly have not been supported in their efforts by the local churches. The plea that the Associations have not contributed to the strength of the local churches is not a convincing answer to the charge that the Church has kept practically aloof from the situation, and that the denominations generally have either been ignorant of the needs of these institutions or unwilling to attempt the solution of the problem.

The value of the Association work lies first in:

(A) *The value of student initiative.* The students work better if they have a part in the planning and execution of the task. Students can often do for each other what an outside agency cannot hope to do. The true objective is the welfare of the student. The upbuilding of the institution which aims to help him is of course a secondary consideration.

(B) *The interdenominational character of the institutions gener-*

ates an atmosphere in which the churches can work to greater advantage.

(C) *Continuous development of leadership is secured*, fresh blood being constantly infused by reason of the changing character of the student body.

Considerations leading to the conviction that the Christian Associations ought not to be left to carry the responsibility alone are as follows:—

(a) Student leadership in religious affairs is not sufficient. Bible teaching and religious counsel by mature and experienced leaders must supplement present activities.

(b) The time and effort required to secure a large membership, organize the work, and raise money for their support often exhausts the resources of the Associations so that there is little left for the real spiritual work.

(c) The rapid growth of State Universities makes it physically impossible to provide a sufficiency of trained workers to command the situation.

(d) Students trained in certain lines of activity well suited to the college community may be easily led away from normal relation to the institutions of society at large. There should be some method evolved that shall so train and develop students at this crucial period of their lives that in the future their interest in the organized life of the Church may be stimulated rather than deadened. The lack of correlation between the churches and the college Associations creates a situation fraught with grave danger.

There appears to have been an impression on the part of Association leaders that the Church, either by default or intent, had turned over to the Associations the entire responsibility for promoting the religious life of college and university students. On the other hand there are happy signs of a new appreciation by the Associations of their responsibility for keeping students in touch with the churches of their choice, and the danger of leading them away from sympathetic interest in permanent forms of religious life. The time is ripe for co-operation and active efforts to effect the same. Co-operation between local forces in a university field is the rule, and it may be that the greatest need for co-operation is not on the part of those on the "firing line" but rather upon the part of those of us who seek to direct national policies. The beginnings of such co-operation will be referred to later in this report.

We now come to the movement which has attracted the attention of all Christian workers in recent years, i. e.

III. THE DIRECT APPROACH OF THE CHURCHES TO THE STATE UNIVERSITY.

Various methods have been put into operation according to the peculiar conditions surrounding a particular field. The method may be determined by the geographical location of the University, by the material assistance provided, by the purpose or ideal of the Church initiating the movement, or by the attitude of the university itself to the proposed enterprise.

The first method that might naturally be employed without prejudice to any interests would be:

(A) The Strengthening of the Activities of the Local Church.

The majority of State Universities are located in small towns whose churches are not generally of a type to attract college students. A university pastor says that the "gulf between the university and the mass of church folk is far greater than any chasm between the rural community and the mass of church folk. We must interest the church membership everywhere in the student communities." Church edifices are as a rule unattractive and inadequate, the welcome perfunctory, and the preaching indifferent. If every denomination would subsidize its work at University centres as the Unitarians have been doing for years, and create a Christian leadership at these centres that would command adequate material equipment and powerful spiritual stimulus, one great difficulty in reaching students would be obviated. The strongest preachers in the country should be stationed at university centres, and their salaries met by the denominations at large. The Presbyterian Church is planning to build a \$50,000 church at State College, Penna., \$20,000 of which has been raised by the townspeople and \$30,000 is being raised by the Synod of Pennsylvania, through the Board of Education. An additional sum of \$25,000 is to serve as an endowment for the extra expenses of maintenance. Such a movement on the part of all denominations would seem to be a timely one. The best exhibition of Christian work by churches in a State University centre is found at the University of Illinois where the geographical position of the university, apart from city influences, has warranted the establishing of churches whose interests are devoted directly to work among the students.

(B) Work Independent of the Local Church.

The placing of academic institutions under church control on or near the campus of the State University has met with some favor by certain denominations. The Disciples of Christ have five institutional enterprises at as many universities, which

they call Bible Chairs. These institutions are provided for by the women's organizations of this denomination and serve to some extent as a substitute for Christian colleges established by other denominations. The Methodists have placed Wesley College at the University of North Dakota, claiming large success for the enterprise. Several theological seminaries are grouped about the University of California, the seminary students taking a number of courses at the university. Whether the Canadian idea, as thus followed in a small way, will eventually be adopted in this country to any extent it is impossible to say.

Religious work at State Universities that does not relate itself to the local church has yet to justify its presence, and the efficiency of its operations. The problem, it seems to us, is not an academic but rather a pastoral one. Provost Smith of the University of Pennsylvania once said that the greatest blessing that could come to his institution would be a revival of religion. And Professor Shailer Mathews, before the Conference of Religious Workers in State Universities, Madison, 1910, said, "I wish that we could have a great religious revival in every educational institution. The demand for it was never greater—a great splendid appeal to the religious imagination that shall make students feel that religion is something more than mere conventionalities of worship." It is obvious that such a revival cannot come independent of the organized religious life of the community surrounding the university.

We come to

(C) The University Pastor.

Nearly three score men are devoting their lives exclusively to the religious interests of State University students. For example, seven are at the University of Wisconsin, five at Michigan, and four at Illinois. The Presbyterians employ ten, the Roman Catholics six, the Disciples five at their Bible Chair centres, the Methodists about five, the Episcopalians four, the Congregationalists one or two, the Baptists three. It is of course understood that where there are buildings, of which there are something like fifteen, called guild halls, Westminister Halls, Newman Halls, and the like, these men centre their work in these halls as well as in the local churches.

The movement is growing rapidly and bids fair to become one of the significant enterprises of the Christian Church. So far religious leadership has been sought among church institutions, but the time has now arrived when we may properly turn to a new source of supply, namely the State Universities. Here we have a field too long neglected by the Church.

It is therefore time for the national leaders of the denominations to decide whether they shall go forward in this movement or halt upon the threshold of what appears to be, according to a University president, "one of the most significant movements of our times."

We must in all frankness state the objections to this movement. It is looked upon by some as a competing movement. The Christian Associations are said to possess the field, and this appears to be an effort to dispossess them of their rightful territory which they have occupied with success during all these years. In view of the levelling of denominational barriers, the spirit of unity pervading Christian bodies in an increasing degree, and the effective measures of co-operation now operating, the effort of the denominations to keep their own students attached to and affiliated with their own church fellowships is looked upon as a symptom of a reactionary movement. Professor Graham Taylor says, "In my judgment the interdenominational co-operation through the college Y. M. C. A. is the most important form of religious work to be done in State Universities, and has the best opportunity to produce effective results for the whole body of students."

Again it is said to be a movement of narrow sectarianism, an effort on the part of the denominations to build up their own churches, the university being selected as the battle ground for the exploiting of "isms" and the emphasizing of creedal differences.

It would appear to your Committee that there has been a confusion in the minds of many as to the proper and relative spheres of work of those who represent the denominations and those who represent interdenominational effort. The distinction appears to us to be clearly drawn. In everything that can be best done interdenominationally, i. e. the conduct of social service activities and the care of all students attached religiously, the initiative, leadership, and responsibility should be with the Christian Associations. In all that can be best done denominationally, i. e. pastoral care of students affiliated with the denominations, conduct of Bible classes in so far as the Church can provide adequately for them, public worship, and spiritual culture and training, the initiative, the leadership, and the responsibility should rest with the local church, reinforced by such assistance as it may require from the national Church body. This distinction draws the line between the educational institution, where students mingle as students, which field is the field of the Christian Associations, and, on the other hand, the community created by the institu-

tion, which community is the province and possession of the Church.

It might be well to quote in this connection some replies received from the authorities of State Universities as the result of an inquiry into their attitude toward the direct approach of the denominations to their institutions. Others looking upon the movement from an impartial position have also written, such as President Eaton, of Beloit College, who says, "It would seem to be the practical thing for the various denominations in any State to build up denominational agencies about the State University and then have these federate themselves for the most effective undenominational service as is being done so well in Wisconsin. While we trust that denominational divisions are passing there is no question that denominational loyalty can be called forth much more effectively than undenominational devotion."

Professor Shailer Mathews of Chicago writes, "We can rejoice in the fact that we are coming to see that denominations are not exclusive but co-operating bodies all working for Jesus Christ. To let denominations decay would be to let the Church decay. What we are getting now is a co-operative protestantism." He believes that larger efficiency will result, and declares, "the various denominations should care for their students in State Universities. I am not writing in a spirit of sectarianism, but as one who recognizes that the denominations are economically necessary to the development of a real effective Protestantism."

President McVey of the University of North Dakota, declares that "In order that young people may grow up into intelligent, wise and sane members of any denomination they need to come into touch during their educational career with the very best that the denomination can give." He pleads also for the affiliated college and the denominational dormitory.

Professor F. E. Kelsey, of the University of Michigan, asserts that "up to the present no other than a denominational agency has been able to attack the situation with any prospect of more than superficial success," and declares that "this work is not primarily for the denomination but for the larger interests of the State and of society in general."

Professor Henry B. Ward, of the University of Illinois, formerly Dean of the Medical School of the University at Nebraska, says that "it is not at all necessary to emphasize denominationalism because this work is conducted under the auspices of some denomination, but that society is at present

organized along these lines and there is no other system through which one can work." "Unless Christian work is done under denominational auspices it will not be carried on."

President James, of the University of Illinois, takes the same view, stating that he would be opposed to the movement if he believed that it would lead to a revival of the old antagonisms, but that the association of denominations in this common work will lead students to a recognition of their duty to the common leadership, and that this would be of far greater value to the community than a mild and insipid co-operation based upon a common indifference to these fundamental questions.

President Van Hise, of the University of Wisconsin, sees no evidence "that within the near future the denominations are to unite". "In the meantime," he asks, "what is to be done with reference to the students who belong to the various churches? This is the practical problem that I, as a university president, must confront. When the sects disappear and churches unite there will be no difficulty about their uniting in their State University work."

President Strong, of the University of Kansas, declares that in his judgment "there never will be a time that the Christian body will not be organized in different groups. There is no feasible method in accomplishing this purpose except in using organizations already at hand."

With reference to the number of men who may be employed by the different denominations at any one institution, a number of correspondents press the point of the physical impossibility of a method in which one or two men have the pastoral oversight of five or six thousand students. They declare that the representatives of any one denomination constitute in themselves a Church parish. Professor Boyd, Dean of Education at the University of Ohio, says, "The enormous registration in our State Universities makes it impossible for one man to do all the needed religious work. Were there a co-operative plan it would be necessary for each church to contribute in some form to the religious work. I know of no better way than for each church to contribute a pastor."

We might indefinitely extend this discussion, but it must be brought quickly to a close. A number of university pastors have written giving their experiences with students and their views of the situation. They unite in their belief that the personal method of approach to the student by a representative of his own denomination is a necessary approach, in that

it means to him the "father and mother" idea of the Church in addition to "the big brother" idea of the Associations.

Briefly then, the reasons for what we believe to be the most feasible and effective method of approach for the churches, i. e., the University Pastor movement, are as follows:—

1. Economy and efficiency require the use of existing machinery.

2. The student must be kept in touch with those religious organizations with which he has to do after leaving college halls.

3. Denominational co-operation is possible in educational centres as in no other community, while sectarian narrowness is more impossible in such a community than in any other section of society.

4. Voluntary associations of students while doing good work are unable to reach the entire student body.

5. Physical conditions at great and growing institutions demand a corps of workers.

One further matter requires the attention of this Conference, i. e., co-operation between religious workers at these university centres. There have been four annual meetings of the Conference of Church Workers in State Universities and notable papers have been contributed. We would call attention to the publications of the Religious Education Association and also to the report of Church Workers in State Universities 1909-'10.

Your Committee has in hand considerable information as to the practical results of denominational efforts at State Universities. It is probable that results rather than theories are responsible for the hearty and unanimous endorsement of the movement on the part of university authorities. Christian leadership is being developed. Hundreds of young people are brought to a personal knowledge of Jesus Christ and led to connect themselves with the Church. Many recruits for the ministry and the missionary life have been secured. One denomination which had not more than four ministerial candidates studying at all State Universities to-day can count forty-four such students.

A University Pastor writes: "Since becoming University Pastor I have been surprised at the number of students who have voluntarily come to me for counsel. These visits are not

social calls but confidential talks. Not infrequently I hear the words, 'You are the first person of whom I have asked this question.' If the conversations I have had the past few weeks with students on personal religion were stenographically reported it would convince the most skeptical of the need of the University Pastor. I have neither time nor physical strength to answer all the calls coming from clubs, sororities and fraternities. My hours are from seven A. M. to eleven P. M. with scarcely a respite. If this work is unimportant then a tremendous amount of energy is being wasted. The registrar in an after dinner speech in the presence of a large company of students, faculty and friends, stated that the religious renaissance in this University began with the coming of the present Chancellor and the establishment of the University Pastorate. He hopes to see the day when each denomination will have its representative."

Your Committee would respectfully present the following recommendation:—

That all the denominations represented in this Conference be requested to consider seriously the problems here presented, direct their national representatives to visit these institutions, study the situation at first hand, and inaugurate a serious effort to meet the religious needs of their own students in these State controlled institutions of higher learning.

Signed,

Joseph W. Cochran,
Edward S. Tead,
Henry H. Sweets.

Comity and Co-operation Between Church and Educational Agencies

BY THE REV. EDWARD S. TEAD, D. D.,

Secretary Board of Education Congregational Church, Boston, Mass.

READ AT THE THIRD CONFERENCE, JANUARY 17, 1912.

At preceding meetings of this conference the present aspects of religious education, as conducted by the various denominations in our country were partially set forth. The time at our disposal did not permit of more than superficial review.

Perhaps at this point, before entering into further development of the program, it may be well to stop and consider the status and significance of this gathering.

We came together at the request of one of our number without definite ideas of what we were to consider or the plans of action we were to adopt. We were then, and are now, feeling our way. In order to get a clearer sight of our course we may well look into one another's faces to see who we are and what we stand for.

In brief, brethren, we may say that we represent the principal religious denominations of our land with their millions of members. Behind us are the consecrated and intelligent clergymen and laymen; behind us is an influential and able church press and a multitudinous literature, behind us is vast wealth amounting to hundreds of millions.

In other words, we are the representatives of a power almost inestimable. We have in our hands a motor that lifts races and subdues kingdoms. I mean the process of enlightenment of mankind about God's world of men and material things. We stand as watchmen along the lines of man's advancing conquest over darkness, ignorance and sin.

Now then the consciousness of our strategic position should shape, control, actuate all our thinking and planning.

This conference may properly inquire whether it has any message to the church of our country. We have not invited our Romanist brethren to our deliberations, but any word from a united Protestantism will have influence with them, and no doubt arouse among them a deeper sense of responsibility in their stewardship.

Have we the right as representatives and agents to make any declarations of moment?

If we decide that we possess the right, do we deem it wise to make such a statement?

If we possess the right and decide it is wise, are we able to arrive at an agreement among ourselves as to what shall be said? Has the right hour struck, the psychological moment arrived, for us to take a stand on any phases of this broad subject of Christian education?

These questions naturally arise in our minds as we contemplate the theme before us. They necessarily force themselves in our deliberations and color our views. These foregoing observations will take clearer shape as we proceed with our subject.

For convenience of treatment let us make three broad divisions of educational institutional standing in close or indirect relation to the Christian church.

I. There are those that have been established for years, strong in endowment, able in teaching force, ample in equipment, large in graduate membership, such as for instance, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Northwestern, Dartmouth, Amherst, Williams, Trinity, Boston University, Hamilton, Marietta and many others too numerous to mention. In addition to these are all the theological and divinity schools, representing various shades of theological thought and denominational polity. There are the professional schools of law, medicine, commerce, etc. Now looking over this broad field we are impressed with the lack of statesmanship displayed in their creation and disposition. We realize in some degree the varying circumstances under which they were called into being, and from the vantage ground of a later day wisdom and experience we believe that there could have been a better distribution. But in spite of all this duplication, they have grown to their present strength through long years of self-sacrificing labors and generous giving of graduates and friends.

In view of a condition that we all recognize, the query arises: Has this conference any word to say, and if so what? Have we any right to assume that any declaration of ours will carry weight? Do we claim that we speak for anybody but ourselves?

The reply may be made that this is wholly outside of our province and that we would better let it alone.

But brethren we cannot close our eyes to the fact that even among strongly intrenched institutions there are murmurs of discontent. It is not true that they are perfectly content with the present condition.

In New England to-day, the fact that there are four Congre-

gational Theological Seminaries is coming into the consciousness of that section and a deal of quiet thinking is going on.

Here are Hartford and New Haven seminaries about thirty miles apart. Here are Harvard and Andover theological seminaries on the same plot of land. Why should not Bangor Theological Seminary move down to Brunswick and stand beside Bowdoin College?

Congregationalists are asking these questions, and what persistent questioning and thinking will bring about no one can foresee. Now is it not true that these same conditions may be duplicated elsewhere in our country, and the query naturally arises, has modern Protestantism as represented by us, any message with regard to this? It seems to me that we have. I believe that we can agree on such an expression as will show that we realize the present situation, and in a way that will not offend any denomination, we may call attention to a new order of procedure and a new spirit which are to dominate Protestant action in the future. The fact that Christian denominations have come to the point where we see the situation eye to eye would be a gain in itself.

II. The second class of institutions are those at present receiving benevolent aid from Christian denominations and more or less closely allied with them, and over which we are exercising some sort of supervision. They are our denominational children, and look to us for guidance and for financial assistance. Have we any word for them?

Before we reply we are confronted by facts that need to be mentioned.

[a] There is first denominational pride. We may as well admit the fact that people of God seek a record as well as a city. Denominational honor is at stake—we want big as well as many institutions.

Our Sunday School Societies want a record of Sunday schools started.

Our Home Missionary Boards like to announce a good record of churches founded.

Our Church Building Societies point with pride to churches erected and parsonages built.

Our Educational Boards rejoice when colleges are sent prosperously on their way. Now these facts have to be reckoned with when we come to talk of united effort.

[b] Then again there is local interest which refuses to be gainsaid.

We all remember what Dr. Butterick said on this point

at our last meeting—how he predicted that local influences would resist any transfer of institutions. You may have noticed in the daily press this summer of the account of an actual occurrence confirming the Doctor's prophecy, where in one town an attempt was made to merge one college with another of the same denomination, resulting in the assault on one of the presidents favoring the new deal! The trades people and other interests may be counted on to obstruct any efforts made to take away their institutions.

[c] Theological differences will, in some instances, stand in the way of union. I was much surprised to meet it this summer.

These three obstacles, and they are not fanciful, will appear as we attempt to deal with the institutions within our province and over whom we might attempt to exercise control. They serve at least to show that any action at present will have to be tempered with wisdom and patience. They show clearly that it will not be easy to bring about changes.

In spite of this, however, it seems to me that there are avenues along which we may make trial, and there are definite things that we as Educational Boards may attempt:

1. We may make the bold announcement to our institutions that unless genuine attempts are made toward closer fellowship we will grant no further aid; but this is drastic and would not be tolerated for a moment. They would stoutly resent our approach to them with a whip in one hand, even though we bore a gift in the other.

2. We could suggest to the trustees of our colleges that they make a real attempt to foster fellowship.

For instance, how would it do for the Trustees of neighboring institutions to get together once a year for a union meeting for the purposes of interchange and mutual conference on local problems? At such a meeting there would naturally arise matters vitally affecting the welfare of each. The most that we secretaries could do would be to suggest the idea to our college trustees, to introduce the parties to each other, and then take our hats and go off for a walk, leaving it to them to find the door of opportunity for future agreement. If need be, we might indicate some of the matters that had been before us and which we thought worthy of consideration. Such as, for instance, uniformity of requirements for entrance; cost of tuition; rearrangement of courses of study; interchange of professors, etc. The trustees of institutions are better able to handle such questions than we are.

I believe that the more our hand as secretaries appears

in any such transactions the less influence we would have, but if it had been previously proclaimed that the religious denominations of the country were looking seriously towards a closer fellowship in all forms of work, then our individual suggestion would receive a respectful hearing to say the least. Our part would be played, if we quietly made it understood among our colleges and schools that "getting together" was in the air and that we as officials cordially endorsed this new spirit.

3. We might, also, in the same connection, suggest to the presidents of our institutions the advisability of calling together the faculties of neighboring institutions for a social function for mutual acquaintance and fellowship. Let the presidents take turns in extending invitations.

We have the right to expect that something more purposeful would grow out of such gatherings that would conduce to a better understanding of one another's work and aim, and would foster a desire for more effective service. The moral effect also of such gatherings in their respective communities would be beneficial, and would pave the way for further fraternal relations.

4. We may also as secretaries let it be known that we favor the improvement of the teaching force in our institutions. I think we could have a settled policy along that line, especially as it is in keeping with the very latest educational theories. Faculty and students make the college and not buildings and equipment.

The objection may be urged that such an improvement involves an increase in expenses and an increase of endowment. That is true.

But has not our effort sometimes been to increase the enrollment in order to secure a large institution? It is this increase in enrollment that demands a greater outlay. Suppose in the future we should unitedly strive, not for numbers, but for greater efficiency in teaching and higher standards of scholarship. Suppose we continually raised the standard and improved the quality of our teaching force. This would inevitably raise the standard of scholarship and we would have no trouble about securing students. This fall while in the West I was told of two college presidents touring the whole state to drum up students. We would be able to keep in the West the larger bodies of students that are yearly enrolled in Eastern institutions because they would get the same high-grade instruction at home that they find in the East. In this way may we not hope to be able in a measure

to meet the great advance being made by our rich state universities. Their size need not disturb us, for the most careful observations along modern educational methods are now inquiring whether we are not making a mistake in massing together great bodies of students.

One very prominent educator has said within a few months that we shall have to come back to smaller groups of students if we are to obtain satisfactory results. In this connection we recall that the individual teacher for the individual student is the Chinese method, and indeed is it not the Divine method? God deals with us as individuals; he deals with us as with sons.

So we may view our small companies of students with a degree of complacency as not out of accord with best educational methods; and we may congratulate ourselves that we are just a little way ahead of the procession.

If something like this may wisely become our policy, we are in a position to bring more or less pressure to bear on their boards of trustees, and may be able to turn their eyes on new lines of action.

While it is true that many of our institutions with their own boards of trustees are beyond our immediate influence, there is yet a class of schools yet more nearly under our control and whose methods we can entirely direct,—I refer to Mission schools.

Here we may put into practice any principles we may think practicable and on which we can agree.

(a) **Conferences.** Since we last met a conference of the mission teachers in the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational schools was held in September in Albuquerque, in the Menaul School (Presbyterian) and with most gratifying results. They made a permanent organization and elected officers. Dr. Heald, superintendent of the Congregational schools, was elected chairman for the year, and an annual gathering was planned.

I have received letters from our teachers testifying to the help they received.

Such a conference should be planned for Utah. Indeed the hour has arrived when we need to present a united front in that priest-ridden state. Our working forces should stand shoulder to shoulder and their union should be made evident. I have already suggested to Dr. Goodwin, our superintendent, that he confer with representatives of your schools on the matter of a conference next fall.

(b) **Territory.** But besides mutual conferences, may we

not arrive at some agreement as to the territory to be covered by these mission schools?

For instance, the Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, and Congregationalists are working in New Mexico. Would it not be feasible for the educational boards of these denominations through their representatives, to make a satisfactory division of territory to be occupied in the future?

(c) **Course of Study.** Furthermore, I believe it would be wise for us to arrange courses in these schools so as to present continuous advance and to prevent duplication of work. These matters are worthy of a conference of the representatives of the denominational boards, which should be held both in New York and on the ground. Our teachers on the field, by their experience and acquaintance among whom they are laboring, would be able to give us substantial help in arriving at wise conclusions. Together with them it would be possible to lay out courses of study that would be of greater value and would better cover the ground. So much in brief by way of suggestion.

From my observation I believe that an advance movement is called for along the lines of Christian education in Utah and New Mexico.

In Utah especially is a militant hierarchy, arrogant, subtle, proud. Bent on extension, teaching a false Christianity and un-American civic principles.

A pure Christianity and genuine patriotism cannot tolerate their claims. There is a ringing call for a steady, persistent, discriminating advance of our religious and democratic ideals in both these great states. Together we can do a mighty work; together we can undermine their insidious propaganda, together we can plant the principles of the Gospel in the minds of the young and so preoccupy the soil.

This conference composed of men devoted to a pure gospel and American ideals should unite upon a policy that will serve with tremendous power the interests of the Kingdom of God in these two sections of our country. We ought to be able to summon all our mighty energies to this task and work unitedly for a moral, civic, intellectual redemption of misled and neglected peoples.

III. A third class of institutions are those yet unborn.

In this new field this conference may do its best, perhaps its chief work. Millions of acres of land sealed up in Indian Reservations will be thrown open; millions of acres now arid and uninhabited will blossom as the rose when the contemplated schemes of irrigation shall have become operative. New

towns and cities will spring up in the desert. All these new sections will become populous, offering unusual opportunities to plant Christian institutions. They offer also an inviting opportunity for denominational rivalry. Shall we witness a scramble for sites and push one another aside in a race for "claims"? Shall we repeat the mistakes of the past in the old-time disorderly and wasteful fashion? It is for us to say.

This conference will have justified its existence if it shall exhibit to the world a reasonable restraint and a conservative treatment of this coming problem.

Certain suggestions in this relation occur to me worthy of our consideration.

(1) Are the members of this conference willing to bring to each meeting a frank statement of new and promising fields that have come to their knowledge; the strategic points available for educational purposes; the character of the religious element dominant in these prospective fields and the probabilities of local financial support, with the view of agreeing on the wisest method of supplying that particular educational need?

(2) Are the members also willing to report any intention on the part of their boards to withdraw from points now occupied by them, with reason therefor?

(3) While the question of primary occupation of new fields is thus under consideration, are the officials of our boards willing to visit the ground together, and at those points where an institution will probably be located, hold conferences or public meetings with citizens, and explain fully our attitude in the matter. For instance, if the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Episcopal officials should visit such a point, and in a public way let it be known that they had come to help, that they came as representatives of denominations acting together, that they believed thoroughly in Christian institutions, and that the citizens should rally to the support of this effort with faith, enthusiasm and financial backing, the inspiration and moral impetus of such a united initiative would launch the institution under the most favorable auspices.

I know that this is ideal and implies a proximity to the millennium, which the present condition of the Christian world may not justify; but the ideal is the only practical thing in the universe, and it will be along just such lines that future action will be taken by our successors and along the lines we ourselves must act if we are to bring about results so sorely needed to-day in the transaction of the King's business.

In closing let me call attention to two possible results of

united effort. It seems to me the days are at hand when much larger sums of money will be needed to carry on successfully the work of Christian education than it has received in the past. Education is the most expensive of all benevolent or missionary work.

Much of the vast wealth of our time is in the hands of men more or less connected with the Christian church. It may be noted in passing that the race that gave religion to the world was also most liberally endowed by the Creator with the acquisitive faculty. Whether our Heavenly Father meant to teach the propagation of religion would best be entrusted to those who were likely to gain the world's wealth, is something which the writer does not venture to discuss; but there the fact lies that the richest nations to-day are the missionary nations.

Since there is this close connection, does it not suggest that our wealthy men may possibly be ready to entrust large sums of money to denominational educational agencies when they show themselves wise in administration, and willing to distribute their funds where they are most needed? When the efficiency of these various societies is demonstrated, may we not expect them to become the custodians and the almoners of men of wealth?

It is a noteworthy fact that two great educational foundations have been created outside the limits of denominational agencies, and it is reasonable to conjecture that if there had been unity of effort, singleness of purpose and breadth of vision these agencies would not have been organized, for they would not have been needed.

A second result of united effort will be to raise the Christian institution to a higher grade of usefulness and make it a mightier power in the true evangelization of the world. Because religious institutions shall have become more efficient, they will elevate the profession of teaching and secure abler young men and women for the rapidly multiplying varieties of Christian service. The whole level of Christian living will be raised and society, state and nation will feel the sturdy and uplifting influence of consecrated youth. The standards of efficiency for service will be raised, and our young men will go forth more perfectly equipped for the exacting demands of the work of the Kingdom.

Report of the Committee on Interdenominational Campaigns

There has been no occasion for a special meeting of this committee, nor is there occasion for an extended report because the plans for an interdenominational campaign could only be made after the work of the other committees had been brought to a much greater degree of maturity than at present.

We believe that it is feasible and desirable sometime during the next four or five years to have an interdenominational educational campaign in America. There should first be prepared a literature common to all the denominations which should set forth in succinct form the ground for the existence of the Christian college, its appeal to men of wealth, its service to the church and to the nation. This literature should be so prepared as to impress Christian men of all denominations with the vital necessity for, and with the great needs of, the denominational colleges. It should set forth the place of the church college in a unified system of public instruction, should present statistics showing the results of the work of the Christian college on the life of the church and of the nation, and the plans and ideals of the real Christian college.

We believe it wise to appoint a committee to outline and present to our next meeting a workable plan for a series of interdenominational conventions covering some definite and perhaps limited portion of the country, but including some of the larger cities and towns. It should include the outline of a program for at least a two-day rally at each of a number of strategic centers. In this rally each denomination should have its separate meetings at proper times, but all should unite in certain general mass meetings, thus emphasizing the autonomy of the work of each in conjunction with the need of co-operation and universal appeal for a nation-wide cause. It should also include provision for the discussion of the relations of church and state schools for higher learning, plans for promoting opportunity for fellowship and better understanding of the problems which such institutions have in common, and should bring out the idea that the time has come when denominational colleges and State Universities, each having a distinctive and permanent place in the American educational system, should reach a better understanding and have a basis of mutual co-operation.

We believe that a general discussion of these various topics before large bodies of the laymen of all denominations would be of the greatest value; that the union of the various denominations in such a series of meetings would attract an attention that the meetings of one denomination alone could not secure; that such rallies would tend to a closer co-operation between the denominations, would aid in the securing of uniform standards of work, scholastic requirements, endowment, and phases of co-operation exceedingly valuable. The great thing, however, at the present time is to awaken the church conscience to the vital need of our denominational colleges. There is an apathy and an agnosticism which is deplorable. Without looking deeply into the subject, hundreds of our people take it for granted that the public schools, the high schools, and the State Universities have supplanted all need for Church colleges and secondary schools. In the awakening of this new consciousness of need, all the denominations should co-operate, and the success of each will enlarge the scope of the success of all. The united effort would enable us to secure the attention of the press as no individual effort could hope to do. The publicity end of the matter should be attended to with scientific care.

It is interesting to note that in the State of Wisconsin such a campaign is now in progress. The denominations have united in a series of meetings soon to be held, the outcome of which we shall watch with great interest.

Committee,

Thomas Nicholson,
John G. Gebhard,
Joseph W. Cochran.

Relation of Colleges to the Church and to Givers

By THE REV. ROBERT MACKENZIE, D. D.
New York

REPRINT FROM THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COLLEGE BOARD OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, MAY, 1910.

The Board is in constant communication with the large giving agencies and with individual givers inquiring as to the position, needs, and qualifications of our colleges, especially as to the changes some of them are making in their charters and methods of governmental control. So far the Board sees no immediate danger of such colleges as have changed their charters losing their Christian character, or of their being less loyal to the standard of education and of positive Christian influence expected by the church. The Board desires to co-operate with and render all possible assistance to such colleges, and expects their loyal and hearty co-operation with the Board in carrying out the educational policy of the church.

Our Presbyterian colleges are not and never have been sectarian: they are broadly Christian in spirit and purpose. When the Presbyterian Church desires a school for the teaching of its distinctive doctrines and government, it establishes a theological seminary. When it desires to do its part in the general work of broadly Christian education, it establishes a college where the distinctive doctrines and polity of the Church are not a necessary part of the curriculum, but where the Bible is regularly taught and where the professors may be and generally are members of different Christian churches. Some of our colleges are denominational only in the sense that the Presbyterian denomination is back of them in securing students and financial assistance, and in encouraging the cultivation of Christian character and preparation for Christian service in all the walks of life.

The Board can intelligently say that the large giving agencies have no desire to withhold their gifts from a college simply because it is denominational in this sense of the word, nor to cut off any college they have assisted from its benevolent affiliation with its denomination, and that they would deprecate its severance from its denomination, which they recognize as a permanent and powerful factor in its continued existence. Mr. Carnegie has contributed in the past six years over a million dollars to colleges under our care. The General Edu-

cation Board has repeatedly made gifts to colleges that are under denominational control, and has no disposition to discontinue gifts because institutions are under denominational control. In its general statement of policy, announced a few years ago, it said, among other things that it was 'to co-operate sympathetically and helpfully with the religious denominations to choose the centers of wealth and population as the permanent pivots of an educational system, to mass its funds on endowment, securing in this work the largest possible local co-operation. It has contributed to thirty-one colleges that are under denominational control and to thirty-two colleges that are not under denominational control.' These gifts appear to be conditioned, not so much on the control of denominational colleges, as on their strategic positions and on the quality of the work they are doing.

Definition of a Presbyterian College.—As there is apparently a doubt in the minds of some, in these days of changing charters and methods of control, as to what constitutes a Presbyterian College, it may be well to call attention to the definition of such a college as found in the constitution of the Board as revised by the Assembly of 1909:

(1) Organically connected with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, or (2) required by its charter to have at least two-thirds of its Board of Control members of said church, or (3) actually under Presbyterian approval at the time of receiving assistance.

"The Assembly declares all of these are Presbyterian colleges and the Board co-operates with them. The Board in its report adds that our Presbyterian colleges are not and never have been sectarian. Some of them are denominational only in the sense that the Presbyterian denomination is back of them in securing students and financial assistance, and in encouraging the cultivation of Christian character and preparation for Christian service in all the walks of life.

"With reference to the colleges which changed their charters, the Board says it 'sees no immediate danger of their losing their Christian character, or of their being less loyal to the standard of education and of positive Christian influence expected by the Church. The Board desires to co-operate with and render all possible assistance to such colleges, and expects their loyal and hearty co-operation with the Board in carrying out the educational policies of the Church.' This view of the Presbyterian college has approved itself to those who are large givers to our college work."

The Work of the Presbyterian College.—The emphatic

word in describing the work of our colleges is **Christian**. They are endeavoring to give a broad, liberal, up-to-date education, but their aim above all else is to give, through the teaching of the Bible and through the personal influence of positively Christian teachers, a **Christian** education. We have learned with gratification of the emphasis laid by the Board on the requirement for Bible study and of its insistence upon unqualified Christian character on the part of all teachers connected with the institutions assisted by the Board or with which the Board co-operates.

The question is sometimes asked, Is the denominational college holding its own in these days when State universities and other secular universities are offering great inducements and rapidly multiplying the number of their students? The answer is an emphatic, Yes. They are more than holding their own. Their equipment is steadily improving and their students also are on the increase.

"If colleges are to be judged by their fruits (and what better way is there to judge them?) the church owes a debt of gratitude to its denominational colleges. They are the principal source of our ministry. Five of our colleges in the West have given nearly one half of their young men to the ministry. They are almost entirely the source of our missionaries, as they still continue to furnish ninety-two per cent. of all our college graduate home and foreign missionaries. However much our denominational colleges may be criticized in some quarters they provide the main sinews of war in our great campaign for Christ."

We quote also the following section of the report to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church under the head of "Co-operation with Colleges":

A Presbyterian college is one which either (1) is organically connected with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, owned or controlled by an ecclesiastical corporation of the Church; or (2) by perpetual charter provision has two thirds of its board of control members of this Church; or (3) is affiliated with this Church by the predominance of adherents of this Church in its foundation board of control, faculty and student body. The term "college" is commonly used herein as including universities.

The Board will seek neither to dominate colleges nor to carry them. It will co-operate with them.

Colleges not yet recognized in the Board's report, desiring approval and co-operation, are requested to send to the Board's

office for blanks on which report of their ecclesiastical, educational, and financial status may be submitted to the Board.

The annual College Conference will be asked to act in an advisory capacity toward the Board in all matters in which an ecclesiastical corporation, administering trust funds, may properly accept information, opinions and advice from a body of experts in educational matters and college detail. The Board will endeavor to be, so far as possible, the voice of the colleges to the Church and the hand of the Church to the colleges.

The Board will seek primarily to stimulate colleges to self-help, and their home fields to the utmost limit of support and endowment; since a college, to have a hopeful future, must ordinarily be strongly based in the affection, prayer and giving of its vicinage. This is true in spirit, though not necessarily in the proportion of gifts from the home field, of colleges distinctively missionary in character and work.

To co-operate in securing endowment for the colleges is the chief function of the Board (Minutes of General Assembly, 1904, page 108, 2 and 6) and to that it will give chief attention. Co-operation with colleges which have little or no endowment, in securing support until their endowments are reasonably adequate, is a necessary but subordinate function.

It will endeavor, in co-operation with colleges, to secure gifts:

(1) The Board will expect every church to make an offering for the cause.


Colleges approved by the Annual College Conference and the Board, and recommended for aid on current expenses, may solicit and receive the College Board offerings of their home regions as these may be agreed upon.

As the Board must depend mainly on Church offerings for funds to pay appropriations voted for unendowed colleges and academies, it is expected that stronger colleges—while seeking individual gifts and, on occasion, additional special offerings from the churches—will not attempt to secure the regular College Board offerings for themselves.

(2) The Board will expect much from individual givers.

Colleges will be asked to restrict their solicitation of funds in outside fields only as the annual College Conference may advise and the Board approve.

The Board requests that colleges planning to solicit funds



MD30.2
N213
JRH
A
1911/12

National Council of the Churches
of Christ in the U.S.A.
Annual report

MD30.2
N213
JRH
A
1911/12

